

Anarchists like strangers. There's not an inch of space for xenophobia.

YOUTH

On the one hand the youth is a commercial category targeted by capitalist companies. On the other it's a social force very often relatively angry, creative, and energetic.

Revolutionary processes will not necessarily come from the youth, but the youth counts as a force. Even if it just means introducing new ideas.

Besides, carrying the banner of permanent revolutionary processes, in a certain sense anarchism itself always remains youthful by definition - as an epitome of constant change.



✓ DATE 10/11/2011 ✓

thank you to everyone who read, corrected, and commented on drafts of this project.

Xenophobia goes along with racism in dividing people along lines of 'ethnicity', or supposedly strictly divided 'cultural identities' to establish or maintain the superiority of one social group over another.

At the same time though the answer here doesn't lie in one right diet for everyone everywhere, but just in being aware of what you eat, and, based upon that, living off an appropriate diet according to the special circumstances of your existence at the time (location, age, health, food options, work, agricultural traditions, trade links, etc.).

Besides, there is a lot to say in support of freeganism, especially for low- or none-income people, but also concerning avoiding cynical waste of food, or social respect at times of invitations, etc.

In the end it's all up to the aware individual to decide.

VIOLENCE

I see violence as consciously harming others physically, psychologically, or structurally. It sucks. But, as much as I respect pacifism, I understand violent resistance in cases of individual or collective self-defense, of course including a people's uprising against a violent regime.

Violence still sucks though, and that's why I don't like the violence-glorifying macho-elements within certain anarchist circles much, as much as I understand the anger and frustration, and the revolutionary urge and impatience they derive from. But it should never lead to contributing to a culture of violence.

Violence should only become a means of fighting if there is at least somewhat realistic hope that the violence used will lead to less violence overall in the long term. And even then the use of violence should always be guided by utter responsibility, care, and measure. The sadness in having to use such force should always remain on our mind.

(Oh, and I do not consider the destruction of corporate property to be violent. Common!)

VOTING

A lot of people associate anarchism with strict and uncompromising non-participation in any form of elections or referendums organized by the governmental authorities, since this would a be an act of submission to the system you claim to hate, and b) support a wrong idea of democracy, in which hunting for numbers completely outweighs any communal decision-making process (see 'Democracy').

Generally speaking, I agree with both these points. Normally, today's elections and referendums are mere jokes, nothing but part of the game over power that State politics are.

But having said that, there can be times in which voting can make pragmatic differences that are not just insignificant for our daily lives. Having a nuclear power plant in your region or not does make a difference, building a new highway or not does, a recycling program does, and so on. And even concerning parliamentary elections, a socialist government can make a difference to a far-right conservative-nationalist government (I'm not saying it necessarily does, and current examples in Europe might indicate the contrary, but I still think it can). So, in these cases, I would say there is nothing that betrays anarchism, if we try to ease the evil we live in a little by supporting the lesser of two or many, just as it doesn't seem to betray anarchism when we're calling on governmental welfare services to do more for the homeless.

If we focused all our energy and political work on elections, yes, that I would see as a contradiction to the anarchist idea. But to make use of the system's institutions and procedures to make our daily lives at least a little less miserable, what's wrong with that? Once again, I don't think overstated ideology not being able to consider the contexts of our daily actions will get us anywhere. It might rather be an annoying and/or cynical obstacle in our struggle.

To begin with

1. In-depth analyses are not the purpose of this booklet. What the text attempts to do is to collect thoughts on anarchism that seem important to me, with a focus on brief and precise formulation. I'd like to leave the necessary further reflections to the reader. All I'm trying to do with what's in here is to inspire. Stimulate thoughts, ideas, concepts, and debates. That's all. Raise a subversive voice. Provide words and phrases that can ideally be used as theoretical tools. Confirm I'm here, in solidarity with other anarchists. Serve, provoke, amuse, piss off, rant, simplify, irritate, please, whatever. But mainly contribute. Contribute to the world-wide anarchist movement, that has all my respect and support, the little I as an individual can give. We all do what we can. Fuck the power.

2. Obviously, what's in here is all just one perspective. I can't provide anything else. There are no claims of righteousness, there are only attempts to suggest ideas and thoughts. Nothing more, nothing less. (And don't let a seemingly generalizing style at times deceive you - it's all just to say things quickly, and make clear points. But there's always an implicit question mark. Honestly.)



ACADEMIA

It makes no sense to just slag off all academia as alienated blabla, and all academics as doing nothing but babbling. Intellectuals are important. Theory is important. (See also the resp. entries.)

At the same time, it is true that the academic environment is not the place for anarchist theory to grow. Academia is a place of formalities, mindless rules, intellectual poverty and boredom, authority, hierarchy, competitiveness, ego-tripping, and petty politics. Academia, as we know it, is an anarchist's nightmare.

But since present-day society hardly provides infrastructure for intellectual work outside academia's borders, anarchists might have to infiltrate. Fine. As long as they know where they are, what they do, and who to fight.

ANARCHY/ANARCHISM

Anarchy is a social condition in which people live together without presupposed authority and hierarchy. That means no special caste of politicians, judges, lawyers, teachers, cops, bosses, or any of that. Anarchism stands for the combined artistic, theoretical, and practical efforts to create, maintain, and defend such a condition.

The way in which people organize their communal life in an anarchist environment is completely open to any procedure imaginable. There's no model for an anarchist society. By definition it creates and recreates itself permanently. As long as there are no presupposed authorities and hierarchies, it's anarchic.

That doesn't necessarily mean it's paradise. Egotistical people can always take advantage of such a condition. But: At least it allows for the *possible* creation of communal life in equality, justice, and solidarity, while at the same time respecting individuality and diversity. No other social condition can do that.

In that sense anarchy can be anywhere. In a house, a festival, a group, a movement, a commune. Even within or next to the State.

The State (representing presupposed authority - see the resp. entry) might never go away. So what? Find its cracks and escape. It might find you there after a while, but hey, then there's others, right?

Create and recreate. That's anarchism.

ANIMAL RIGHTS

I don't really believe in universal moral reasons (see also 'Morality'), so I don't see how including the life of animals into concepts of anarchism could be based on any.

But, regardless of universal moral reasons, it only seems natural to do that if we are dedicated to a just life avoiding as much cruelty as possible. And the use of animals as imprisoned pets, zoo exhibits, guinea pigs, fashionable clothing, or a luxurious diet is cruel. It's horrible to see, it's horrible to know it exists. Supporting animal rights means supporting a less cruel world. In a way, that's what anarchism is all about.

ANTI-AUTHORITARIANISM

Anarchy stands and falls with its uncompromising commitment to anti-authoritarianism.

Yes, there are people who know more about certain things than others, or have superior

support is obligatory.

The more anarchist tool might of course remain the syndicates (see the resp. entry).

TRIPLE OPPRESSION

Triple Oppression must be welcomed as an analytical term amongst anarchists, since it stands against simplified and reductionist theories of oppression overemphasizing one of its main expressions in form of class, race, or sex. It so allows for wider and more complex analyses of current modes of oppression.

The only problem might actually be, as already stated by a range of social activists, that the term still excludes a number of structurally also oppressed communities, like non-heterosexuals, people with disabilities, or - if one sees it that way - animals or ecosystems.

I'd actually agree. Triple Oppression is cool, but maybe Multiple Oppression is even better.

UTOPIANISM

Utopianism can basically work in two ways. I think: either as a universal abstract social ideal that one feels legitimized to try to put into praxis by all means necessary - or as a collection of multiple singular images of a just society that motivates and stimulates current struggles.

The former I find highly dangerous, and I wish it didn't play a role within the anarchist movement, since it can easily lead to the denial of realities, an arrogant avantgardistic attitude, narrow-mindedness, and unmeasured means of fighting.

The latter though, I highly appreciate as a source of hope and inspiration from where energy, creativity, and joy can be drawn. Also, such a utopia keeps alive the wish and will to change, and we won't buy the rulers' suggestion that any such wish or will is silly because 'utopian'.

If it's about that I'm all for utopia. Just don't let it become a fixed and static idea determining your every action today, but let it remain a panorama of everchanging colors well worth fighting for.

VEGANISM/VEGETARIANISM

I don't think the matter of what we eat is the key to everyone's liberation, but obviously our diet has highly moral, social, and ecological significance, and considering what we eat is part of being aware of what we are and do (see 'Awareness'). In this respect veganism and vegetarianism are undisputable contributions to a world of more awareness and less cruelty.

I don't think, however, that veganism is necessarily the most superior option, or that fish- or meat-eating is a universal sin. The consumption of eggs or dairy products, for example, can derive from a relative intimate and respectful relationship between animals and the people caring for them. I'm convinced that such products, coming from truly organic farms, are in certain areas of the world socially and ecologically more sound than energy-intensive soy milk or imported fruits. And an argument like that might even be drawn for fishing and hunting, maybe even the occasional slaughter of domestic animals, in certain communities.

Generally speaking, yes, in modern society a vegan diet will mostly be the least cruel, especially if it takes social aspects of food purchase into account as well (to buy locally, etc.). It would be in this respect probably followed by a vegetarian diet.

THEORY

Nobody likes too much blabla. We all know that. Nevertheless, it doesn't make a lot of sense, I think, to come up with vulgar anti-theoretical stands because of that. If theory means to reflect upon certain social, political, or economic relations and complexities in order to try to understand the interconnectedness of things and their functions, and, based upon that, try to find ways of change or resistance, theory is an integral part of anarchist life and struggle. In order to save it from academic degeneration (see also 'Academia'), I'd say the following points should act as guidelines:

1. Theory doesn't belong to a particular group of people, but to everyone.
2. Theory shouldn't be pretentious and universal and general, but modest and local and specific.
3. Theory shouldn't be self-centred, but created and debated in direct relation to our everyday lives and struggles.

Theory like that won't be separated from praxis, not trying to model or lead. It'll be the praxis of thought, being at the heart of the struggle. A weapon. It's up to us to make it as sharp as possible.

THIRD WORLD

The 'Third World' - as well as the 'Fourth World', as indigenous people are now more and more commonly referred to - is in itself an arrogant and derogatory colonial term. It is used here only as a terminological compromise that allows me to refer to the common problem of the communities thrown into this category by the ones who like to call their lousy world the 'First'. The common problem I am speaking of is material poverty as a result of colonial history.

Even though they weren't the only colonizers, Europeans have colonized (almost) the entire globe, and created the needs for basic 'modern' life with permanent houses, power and water supply, schooling, and a participation in the global culture and economy, amongst practically all of mankind. Whether that's a pity or not, is not really the question. That it's a fact matters, and that these needs are not fulfilled in most non-European communities is a fact that matters even more.

There is a duty and a responsibility to give back, share, and right the wrongs as far as possible. Colonizing powers created the world's poor for taking them on a road to modernity, and then abandoning them in the middle of nowhere. That doesn't mean these people are weak, or incapable of self-determination. Not at all, and their self-determination should be respected in every regard, including where and what they want to head for. It's not about leading and patronizing. It's just about giving back. It's about solidarity instead of exploitation. No hypocritical neo-colonial development work supporting mainly businesses and workers in the economically rich world and only a local elite in the economically poor - instead support where we are asked to provide it.

Maybe many worlds, but no rankings. Fuck the 'First World' especially. Make the worlds economically equal by sharing their riches. (See also 'Development'.)

TRADE UNIONS

Per se definitely not revolutionary any more, but rather institutionalized, trade unions can still be activated as the classic tool of the workers' resistance and struggle, and in such cases the anarchist

skills in certain fields, and it's fine, often actually very beneficial and helpful, and therefore appreciated, when these people share their knowledge with others, act as temporary guides, or whatever. This has nothing to do with acting out authority, it has simply to do with individual contributions to a collective life of solidarity. Authority starts where certain individuals are awarded a special status of power due to their (real or supposed) knowledge and/or skills. With this, hierarchy and injustice are introduced into the community, and all doors to repression and corruption opened. Anarchists can't have that.

The people who help others with their knowledge and skills in an anarchist community won't receive special status, attention, or reward. Not even special respect, other than the respect everybody gets. They do what you do if you're an anarchist. You share. Plus, whoever has to share in certain fields, has to take in others. And if there's anarchy, no part of social life is worth more than another, so special status is impossible.

Plus, anarchists know the difference between self-confidence and self-righteousness. They will *always* listen to questions and suggestions concerning what they say or do.

Anarchists give each advice, solve each conflict, and make each decision as equals.

People suggest, propose, defend, question, get excited and passionate ... but they *never* tell others what to do. That's for politicians, cops, or teachers. Anarchism doesn't know of such people.

ANTIFASCISM

(See 'Fascism'.)

ART

Art as a creative process is in itself revolutionary, since creativity is an inherent part of anarchist activity (see 'Anarchy/Anarchism'). In a certain sense anarchy itself is an artform.

Works of art, however, do not just represent that revolutionary creativity, they might also represent the artist's conscious or subconscious intentions, aesthetic norms of certain social groups in certain places at certain times, etc. And they definitely do not just portray revolutionary creativity, since they might be (both rationally and emotionally) interpreted in non-revolutionary (even reactionary) ways, used for political propaganda, capitalist brainwashing, or artistic escapism. So, art as a whole is by no means per se revolutionary. But all art holds revolutionary potential.

The freer the artist and his or her environment, the clearer this becomes. That's why in general a DIY-Punk-gig is still a way more revolutionary event than a classical opera performance in an opera hall. But as the Punk-gig can turn out to be a boring non-event, a certain opera performance can free a certain individual. We never really know.

If art is liberated from realpolitical and economic use, it becomes a truly revolutionary force. As such it is nothing but enlightening and energizing. It goes both ways: The artists have to liberate themselves from the State and the Capital through their art and its presentation; and we have to liberate them from the State's and the Capital's pressures. As always, it demands a collective effort.

AUTONOMY

Being autonomous is a central value to anarchists, and autonomy as a term has important emotional significance for the anarchist struggle.

It's not the autonomous modern individual we are after though. Here autonomy means abstract separation in order to rule and control in a permanent fit of egomania. Being autonomous for us means being free and independent (both of which is explained in the resp. entries).

The quintessence here is that within the anarchist context an autonomous life means a life away from, or directed against, authority and the subconscious infiltration by the political and economic rulers. It's a life of self-determination. It's the basis for anarchist communities.

Autonomy is a precious term, and despite of its mentioned use in fucked up contexts I refuse to give it up. But filled with anarchist spirit and action there'll never be a question whether we'll have to do that anyway. Autonomy for all.

AVANTGARDE

A vanguardes suck.

Creativity and all is always appreciated, and sometimes groups will have created something uncommonly original and worth sharing, but that doesn't make them 'more advanced', 'ahead of their time', or 'natural leaders'. Anarchism doesn't know of such things.

Gifts and achievements are there for all to be shared, not for an exclusive group of individuals to gain special status.

AWARENESS

Awareness is one of anarchism's personal key virtues, directly linked to another, namely responsibility (see the resp. entry).

Leaders justify what they do by emphasizing their followers' limited knowledge. Naively following that doctrine and letting others do your thinking and decision-making does not only legitimate their claims, but also provides the basis for disastrous fascist mass movements, or just willing cannonfodder for the leaders' businesses and wars.

Becoming and being aware of who and where you are, what you do, and how you relate to the world around you, puts you in a position to take your thoughts and actions into your own hands - quintessential for the creation, maintenance, and defense of anarchist life.

And it's not demanding everyone to be a superhero with universal knowledge. In fact, to know your limits is part of being aware. It then just becomes a question of doing the appropriate thing about it (like not placing your trust blindly, but consciously, etc.).

Again, just be aware of who you are, what you do, and how you relate to the world around you - and you'll go a long way.

BAKUNIN

I just picked one individual representative of anarchist history in here. The choice was Bakunin, because he is probably anarchism's most reputable individual symbol. There are others: Godwin, Proudhon, Kropotkin, Malatesta, Durutti, Machno, Landauer, Goldmann, etc. Doesn't matter. It's not about them here, really. It's about the status of 'big' individuals within anarchist thought.

'Cause it's not that easy. Leaders, or teachers, or masters, or idols, are all against the anarchist idea. At the same time, the mentioned - and many other - individuals' contributions to the cause were essential. It makes no sense to be anti-Bakunin just 'cause he's widely read and respected amongst anarchists. It's not about that. It's about the way we deal with these individuals. And we should deal with them as comrades. Just like any other. Unlike thousands of others, they

exclusive focus on the working class as a revolutionary force, but in general syndicalist struggles still seem to be by far the most useful tool for workers' self-liberation, which means they need all the anarchist support they can get.

TECHNOLOGY

In my eyes, like so many things, technology is neither good nor bad, it all depends on the use we make of it. I do know that this is a) pretty trivial, and b) an argument used by multinationals to cover up their ecological destruction and turn it into a supposedly heroic campaign to save the planet. But I don't think that makes the statement above untrue, it just tells us that we have to be careful in our assessments of technology's use.

To give general guidelines proves very difficult, though. Whether a certain use of technology at a certain time at a certain place helps people to ease hard labor and to enrich their creative possibilities, while still being socially or ecologically sound, or whether it becomes a dominant monster controlling us, holding us in dependency, ruining social interaction, and destroying the environment, is up to the people concerned to evaluate specifically. But I'm not the least bit worried that people in anarchist communities will come up with the right decisions necessary to put technology to (at least mainly) positive use.

TERRITORY

In principle, all land belongs to everybody. Okay. At the same time, ecologically speaking, certain areas of land only allow a certain number of people to live on and from it in sufficiency and dignity. So, if all land belongs to everybody, everybody must be willing to share it properly as well.

The borders drawn by modern nation States don't do this job at all, of course. They are arbitrary lines dividing land and people according to power, instead of uniting them in spirits of fair distribution and solidarity. The real question of who 'owns' what land, can only be answered by the people working it, living of it, and feeling connected to it.

Generally, no special people have an exclusive right to any special territory, so basically any individual or any community can make any territory they choose their home. This notion is at anarchism's heart.

However, even anarchists can't deny that fights over territory do, and might always will, occur. I'd say that part of what was said above concerning people 'owning' land they work and feel connected to, they will always have to be respected as (part-)owners' of the respective territory by newcomers. That means that colonial or imperial superiority is always against anarchist beliefs.

At the same time, if non-colonial migrants arrive, communities with space to give, so to speak, should willingly do so in the mentioned spirit of distribution and solidarity. This even more so, if the migration bringing new people to their territories has been to a great extent caused by them. That's why any immigration restrictions to modern Western countries will always be against anarchist beliefs as well.

State politics will never solve conflicts over territory. Only the people involved can do that. By accepting and learning to willingly share as equals. As trivial as it may sound, I really think it all comes down to that. Even in Sri Lanka, Ireland, or the Middle East.

but what is ever total and without dangers? I do not only believe that these State-free zones can coexist with the revolutionary struggle - I do believe they can play a very important part in it: since anarchists experience bits of what they are fighting for in these zones, they constitute an ideal base to create anarchist identities, gain self-respect, tank energy, and provide examples of anarchist ways of life.

In the end, if we don't cling to the quasi-religious idea of an ultimate, global, eternal revolution, which I do not suggest (see also 'Revolution' and 'Utopianism'), this is all we'll ever fight for: eradicate State power relations wherever as widely as possible, and thereby open up spaces to create something else.

The State is dull and static. Anarchism is creative and dynamic.

STREETS

The streets are a synonym for public space in general. As such they are of great significance for the anarchist struggle, as this struggle is not exhausted by opposing governmental institutions, but fascist conduct everywhere.

A lot of our political life happens away from parliaments and such. It happens in our private lives, but also in the public sphere, or, see above, the streets. It's an area where everyday racism and sexism and related forms of oppression occur, ranging from verbal abuse and harassment over offensive advertising to violent threats and abuses.

'Beat the Fascists wherever you can', or 'Reclaim the Streets', remain important anarchist slogans. We gotta be loud, we gotta be seen, we gotta interfere, and we gotta occupy any space before the fascists can. That's what the famous streetfighting is really all about, not just the cobblestone (which, nevertheless, might of course get involved - but that's not the point here).

SUBCULTURE

Subcultures are minority cultures created within, but, more or less, apart from a mainstream culture. Politically they can belong to the extreme left as well as to the extreme right. Subculture itself is not necessarily revolutionary.

But parting from the mainstream, and evolving from creative processes, anarchist activities will always have subcultural character. So, while not every subculture is anarchist, all anarchist communities will constitute subcultures.

Subcultures as counter-cultures (see the resp. entry) that is. Not identity-labels created for selling products, which is the commercialized contemporary form of subculture, and yet another reason that doesn't allow us to equalize the term automatically with revolutionary forces.

But again, it's still subcultures that anarchists will have to create within the State and the Capital, so we can't give up on the term. Neither good nor bad per se - but necessary and revolutionary if developed with the right attitude.

SYNDICALISM

Syndicates define themselves as being entirely self-determined by the workers, and by not following anyone else's political interests or bureaucratic advice.

Workers have always resisted against exploitation and injustice by forming syndicates, and syndicalist struggles have always accompanied the wider anarchist struggles.

I've come across syndicalist texts that struck me as a bit reductionist in terms of their

left written records of their thoughts and actions, and/or played certain key roles in anarchism's history, and through that encouraged and stimulated others. All of which deserves respect. But then again, in the end, they are still nothing more but comrades.

Since there's no place for idol-worship in anarchism, there's none for idol-trashing either. Both is boring. And boredom we don't want.

CAPITALISM

Capitalism sucks. Of course. Everybody with half a heart knows that. It creates injustice, greed, egoism, competitiveness, exploitation, war, corruption, famine, you name it. It's the force of evil. But I don't think it's the root. To blame it all on capitalism might be reductionist. Pre-capitalist societies were patriarchal and violent and authoritarian. And non-capitalist versions of the State are the same.

The evil has no roots. It's just there. Everywhere. And it expresses itself. As in capitalism. But not only. Maybe there was really the State before there was the Capital (as radical anthropologists like Pierre Clastres have suggested), but maybe that question doesn't even matter. What matters is that we need to reduce our material needs to allow us to cater for them on a just communal basis.

However that's gonna be organized is open, as everything should be. Of course there can't be bosses. And it's hard to see how there could be money, since the abstraction of labor is the first step to economic gamble. But apart from that, whatever really. As long as it follows the anarchist spirit of solidarity. If it does we can't go wrong.

But then capitalism seems so overwhelming. Well, so what? So does the State. Again, it's the cracks we are heading for (see 'Anarchy/Anarchism').

Plus, as long as capitalism is there, we take from it what we can take. It's fun to shoplift five different brands of coke. Don't dwell in misery and self-pity. Have fun with the enemy. You know it sucks anyway.

CLASS

As many others I don't believe in reductionist class-analysis as the ultimate in explaining social injustices. Racism, sexism, or speciesism can't be reduced to class antagonisms (see also 'Triple Oppression', and the resp. entries).

Nevertheless, class remains a category of social division, and hence a potentially revolutionary force. Also, class (as any other form of collective categorization and identification) is flexible and dynamic as a term describing economic and/or labor-divisions within society, hence a revolutionary class-analysis has in no way to stick to working-class-models of the 19th century. To dismiss class-analysis just 'cause there are some outdated examples is too easy, and might prove harmful to revolutionary theory.

In an unjust economic system exploited classes will always be here to stay. And, hopefully, here to fight.

COLONIALISM

Colonialism denies people's self-determination, and therefore sucks. Not a question. Every argument (or excuse) for it - from bringing civilization and technological progress, to protecting whoever's interests - is nothing against the initial violation of one of anarchism's most basic

principles.

I'm not against anybody going to other places - not even Europeans. If you want and can, go. Actually, ideally that can even help overcoming cultural and ethnic misconceptions and prejudices. Also, I have nothing against the exchange of whatever you think you have to offer: ideas, tools, artifacts, technology. Whatever. As long as it's an *exchange*.

Colonialism has nothing to do with that. It's oppression and indoctrination. In the worst cases it even robs people of their capacity to self-determination by destroying traditional knowledge while denying access to any other.

In that sense anti-colonialism must also focus on more than just having the colonial powers go away. It must be about minimizing the wrongs. Europeans today (as all former colonizers generally) have got a fucking responsibility. Not to be smart. To fucking listen and serve.

COMMUNES/COLLECTIVES

Regardless of all stories about failed attempts or accusations of escapism, communes or collectives remain the cornerstones of any anarchist movement.

If there is anything that might come close to an ultimate ideal in anarchism, it's the creation of self-determined, egalitarian communities. And that's what anarchist communes or collectives are - or at least try to be, which, for christ's sake, is way more than good enough!

A patchwork of diverse anarchist communities is an anarchist's dream. And if some, or even all of them, crumble and fall at one stage, so fucking what? Something else will be created elsewhere.

Anarchist life is supposed to be everchanging. Continuity is for reactionary bores.

COUNTER-CULTURE

Dominant culture represents dominant politics and economy. Anarchist life necessarily is counter-cultural, and creates counter-cultures (which doesn't imply that every counter-culture is anarchist - but fascist movements are not what we are talking about here).

Former radical counter-cultures regularly become absorbed into the mainstream, but that doesn't really matter, since anarchist culture is permanently changing anyway, and counter-cultures will therefore permanently be recreated.

Being involved in this process of creating and recreating counter-cultures is actually at least half the fun of being an anarchist. Why wait?

CRIME

Crime is defined by the Law which belongs to the State (see the resp. entries). So, enemies of the State will always be labelled criminals. In this sense the label might as well be seen as a badge of honor.

That's not to say, though, that each criminal is automatically an anarchist. Certain acts labelled as a crime by the Law of the State would hardly be condoned in anarchist communities either (rape or murder as some of the most obvious ones). A huge number of people now known as criminals has never been engaged in such acts, though. A huge number of them are now known as criminals because they have challenged authority, haven't obeyed crypto-fascist rules, taken what's supposed to be theirs anyway, tried to live a life outside of State control, or simply

emotions like anger or frustration. And these will never fully disappear. Again, anarchism is no paradise (see 'Anarchy/Anarchism').

Winning and losing is part of many games, true, but I don't see it as a big deal, as long as there are absolutely no social rewards for winning or punishments for losing. These would be highly dangerous and extremely harmful to any anarchist community. But as long as the win or loss concerns nothing but the game, and both sides follow original sports notions of mutual respect, it's just a part of playing.

It sometimes breaks my heart to see the use of sports in today's society, but that's probably true for everything. Then again, there are moments of individual and collective antifascism in sports, even if rare. Plus, everything can be DIY, and so can sports. In the end, it's always just up to us.

SQUATTING

Especially in Europe it might have been the squatters scene over the last 20 years that gave anarchist activists and their ideas the widest publicity.

Cutting through the power networks of State and Capital by taking what should belong to the people anyway, squatting contributes essentially to the creations of State-free zones (see 'State') in which anarchist life forms can be experimented with.

The houses to the people.

STATE

The State is the anarchist's ultimate enemy. It embodies, manifests, organizes, and maintains everything anarchism stands against: authority, hierarchy, oppression, injustice, social control (see 'Anarchy/Anarchism').

I do believe there are much worse States than others, and there is a difference between, for example, States based on a liberal parliamentary constitution on the one hand, or a military regime on the other. To deny the levels of relative freedom and justice can easily become very cynical. Nevertheless, even the 'best' State remains just that: a State.

Moreover, it seems to make sense to suggest that the State actually does not only signify a certain way of national political organization, but also a general model of people's interrelations that can be, and is, reproduced everywhere: in the family, at the workplace, in a sports club. As much as we gotta get rid of it as a political entity, we gotta get rid of it as an idea in our heads. The enemy is everywhere, and will always be, at least as a potential danger. The anarchist's fight against the State is permanent. It's part of an anarchist's life.

Seeing the State as being more than just a political entity is actually rather liberating than demoralizing. I think. Because it means that the State's power is not reduced to its governmental representations. If the State can be reproduced everywhere, it can be eliminated everywhere. A bunch of people (even an individual) who don't reproduce the State in daily life and who might actually deconstruct it, create little State-free zones, so to speak (kinda like what Hakim Bey calls 'Temporary Autonomous Zones'), in which anarchist life can flourish.

Of course, these zones are never entirely free, and the modern nation State is extremely totalitarian, and I'm aware of the fear expressed from within anarchists ranks that the ideas presented here are, or might lead to, substituting privatist escape for revolutionary struggle for social change, but I don't think that necessarily has to be the case.

Yes, of course it's not total anarchy, and of course there are dangers of exclusive retreat,

SPIRITUALITY

Spiritual beliefs might be separated from religious beliefs insofar as they do not necessarily constitute a universal world-view providing essential answers of creation, meaning of existence, ethics, life, and death (concerning religious beliefs, see 'Religion'). Spiritual beliefs might just consist of simple ideas or beliefs in forces other than material, or they might be of a more complex nature, very often inspired by Eastern thought, without necessarily fitting into any particular religious framework. Hence, spirituality and/or spiritual practices can reach from the reading of cards, astrology, dream analysis, believing in fate, karma, or reincarnation, practising breathing, yoga, or meditation, to going on a spiritual search, looking for enlightenment in monasteries or ashrams, studying anthropology, or hanging out in esoteric bookstores.

Nothing of this has any political meaning in itself, I'd say. It all depends on the ways any of these interests, beliefs, or practices find expression in the general daily conduct of the people involved. The spectrum ranges from radical left-winged neo-hippies to freaky fascist esoteric yuppies.

I personally have no inclinations here whatsoever, and I have to admit that a lot of the things labelled spiritual strike me as remarkably bizarre at times, but again, that alone doesn't mean much, and I also know of a number of individuals who are as anarchist as they are spiritual. I guess it's all a matter of cool. On both sides. I know there are the 'spiritually enlightened' who feel they alone have sorted shit out and feel superior enough to belittle, ridicule, and disrespect any efforts of political, rather than purely personal, change, and if they get shit for that by the activists I can't exactly say I feel sorry for them. But, at the same time, discrediting someone just for being into chanting mantras or performing pagan rituals doesn't seem to be appropriate either. The people involved might still sincerely support the struggle.

Plus, it's true that individual change has to accompany restructuring the social order, since our enemies have even infiltrated our heads (see also 'Power' and 'State'), and if certain spiritual practices help some with that, I'm happy for them and for us.

As with everything, it's all a matter of the context in which singularities are placed. Anarchist webs can be made of anything at least potentially antifascist.

SPORTS

Sometimes a slightly snobbish attitude towards sports can still be found within anarchist circles. It mostly evolves around aspects of sports' supposed political insignificance; its function to delude the masses; its potential to stir up nationalism; its competitiveness; or its commercial character.

What I don't agree with at all really is the alleged political insignificance. Sports are as political as everything else. Identifying politics with realpolitik only limits our understanding of social dynamics. (See 'Politics'.)

The other points of critique I understand, but I don't think sports are to be blamed, but the political and economic framework they are condemned to exist in today. Sport is just another victim: Its delusion of the masses is due to its instrumentalization by the ruling forces - the same goes for popular arts, for example. Its potential to stir up nationalism exists because we live in a nationalist world - no nations, no nationalist sport. Its competitiveness reflects capitalist doctrines - no capitalist ideologies, different (more play, less fight) attitudes in sport. Its commercial character fulfils capitalist needs - again, no capitalism, no commercialism.

I like sports. They are fun, and socially acceptable means of letting go of negative

because they are poor or victims of racist cops and judges. Very often the lines between social revolutionaries and petty criminals are very blurry at best.

I'm really not into romanticizing any 'O.G.' or any 'thug life'. I'm also not suggesting everyone with a prison sentence is a comrade. But I am saying that the label of the criminal is a label of the State, used to defend, maintain and strengthen its power. Hence, there will always be a lot of revolutionary energy and force united under this label. It seems advantageous to be aware of that.

DEEP ECOLOGY

Deep Ecology contributed a lot to the awareness of and respect for ecosystems, and helped widening the sense of community to include them. I think it has served an important purpose doing that. - It is also a radical school of thought, and as such it is challenging and thought-provoking which has its merits in itself.

At the same time, narrow-minded fundamentalist ideas have emerged on that basis, making wilderness the center of world liberation, and thereby showing social insensitivity, and sometimes even promoting outspoken misanthropically colored xenophobia, racism, and a macho-survivalist ideology. This Deep Ecology is dangerous and has no place in anarchism.

As so often, it's a question of moderation, and the distinction between contributing to an anarchist universe of ideas on the one hand - and trying to solemnly define such a universe on the other. All for the former, none for the latter.

DEMOCRACY

Democracy is fine and it's not. As always, it depends on interpretation, but here maybe even more so than usual.

Which other term is used so extensively in political talk today to make things sound right? In that sense it's actually completely meaningless, even very hypocritical and annoying at times. But people do give the term meanings, and it's around in anarchist discussions as well, so here is what it comes down to for me: If democracy means 'Power to the People' it equals anarchism; if it means counting crosses in ballot boxes it has, at best, very little to do with it.

I don't think, however, it's *all* the same. I do think the ballot box can function as a means to not let power become too abusive for the majority of people, and I rather live in a parliamentary democracy than a military regime. But this kind of democracy is just about a tiny bit of control of power. It's not about self-determination whatsoever. Just ask its minorities.

People power - and hence 'anarchist democracy' - is active involvement in creating your community. Not having political corporations known as parties gamble over power. What a sad joke.

DEVELOPMENT

Development is a tricky term. In political discussion today it is mostly used to describe a social process focused on technological progress and economic gains, bringing economically poorer countries to the standards of the economically rich industrialized world. Of this development we want no part. First of all, we don't consider modern industrialized society to be a model other societies should have to adapt. Secondly, given current development strategies, this would only contribute to further exploitation and indoctrination of the poor anyway. In this sense,

development policies today pretty much equal neocolonialism.

At the same time, we don't want to romanticize economic poverty either. Being economically poor is neither fun, nor does it automatically make a society morally superior. The shift's everywhere. Greed, tyranny, jealousy, xenophobia, social exclusion, etc., are global and eternal enemies. I find romanticized notions of - for example - India or Tibet rather shortsighted, escapist, and potentially dangerous (for everybody, in the given examples Indians and Tibetans themselves). But, if we look at economically poorer countries and regions without any notions of romanticism, it becomes hard to flatly condemn any talk of development. To do so could even be cynical. I mean, regardless of the historic reasons behind it, a lot of people without power, water supply, proper permanent housing, schooling, and medical facilities want these things. And since these needs were created through colonialism (see above), the former colonizers have a fucking responsibility to help provide them. And this responsibility remains, even if we are convinced that development is not really that great after all. So, if development in a pragmatic sense means that: the provision of unsatisfied basic needs of economically poorer communities, and that's really all that's going on (which it hardly ever is, but anyway), then I'd suggest support of adequate development projects.

Besides, there is a certain dimension of *social* development I believe in. It's not linear, not exclusive to certain cultures and areas. It rather comes and goes, and reappears, and moves around. But everywhere it's the process of the liberation of the individual from oppressive collective orders, and the belief of the liberated individual that uncompromising solidarity with its fellow beings brings more happiness than egotistical competitiveness. The in this sense enlightened individual is the cornerstone of any anarchist community. It displays the essential individual characteristics that an anarchist community is built on: independence, awareness, responsibility (see resp. entries). A lot of cultures and a lot of times have known such individuals. To help develop a social environment in which more and more of these individuals will be known would then be a form of development that'd be well worth being pursued by us anarchists.

'DISABLED'

There exist quite arbitrarily defined standards of full physical and mental ability, and hence some people are called 'disabled' - and very often receive a treatment making sure they'll never forget they're not equals to the ones fulfilling the standards.

Anarchists have standards, and in an anarchist community people won't be separated along such lines.

That doesn't mean to deny that some people can't hear, or walk, or calculate, and, as with every other individual characteristic, people will be conscious of that in their interaction with each other, but that's about it. Just differences, and never social segregation, leave alone stratification, or exclusion.

Generally, anarchists will always support the fights of the 'disabled' for their rights and acceptance, not out of paternalism, but out of the objection to oppression and injustice of any form, and the desire for communities of diversity in equality.

DIVERSITY

Diversity is essential to anarchism. Together with its uncompromising commitment to anti-authoritarianism it might be the notion dividing anarchism most strictly from other leftist movements.

not some imaginary event at the end of history, but something that is made a reality by living according to its principles; anywhere, anytime.

Anarchist lives can always be lived, and anarchist communities can always be created, even if just within a shared flat. Don't wait, not for the revolution, not for anything else. Just make things happen.

SCIENCE

Science can do good, and it can do bad. It's a matter of responsibility, and of appropriate use. A science liberated from the State and the Capital can sure be fun. A science aligned with these enemies will always be an enemy too.

Generally, the same principles apply that I will try to sketch in 'Technology'.

SEX

Everybody can have sex with everybody or everything in whichever way he or she likes, as long as everything happens in mutual consent.

I don't believe in stigmatizing any sexual activities, like it happens somewhat regularly with sado-masochism, as reproducing crypto-fascist ways of conduct or something. If that's the way some people wanna have fun, let them have it without making it problematic.

Of course abuse of power, domination, and violence have a lot to do with sex, but I don't think it's so much a matter of certain practices, as a matter of unequal relationships. If sex (no matter what kind) is forced upon you against your will, it sure ends being fun. Whether the force comes from physical violence, psychological pressure, or a status of power and authority doesn't matter. In no such case can there be anything like true mutual consent.

The idea central to anarchist sex is that it happens between equals. Based on this there is complete freedom in choosing one's sexual practices. The important line doesn't appear to be the one between 'soft' and 'hard' sex. It appears to be the one between free and abusive sex. All for the former, none whatsoever for the latter.

SEXISM

(See 'Feminism' and 'Gender'.)

SOCIALISM

This term today is so wide, starting a discussion within the modest frame of this text almost seems ridiculous. Thus only so much:

Where socialism means wishy-washy pseudo-leftist party politics, it is very irritating, to say the least. Where it mainly means conformity, it is very irritating as well. Where it means a way of living together under the guidelines of equality, justice, and solidarity, or simply sharing with each other, it's an essential part of anarchism.

Only in this last sense anarchists will always be socialists, but then uncompromisingly so.

SOLIDARITY

Central value to anarchism. *The* notion against modern egomania. Not more to say.

RESPECT

Respect is what realistically unites people. Never will everybody get along well with everybody else, life's just too complex, I guess. But that's not necessary either. As long as there is respect - respect for others' lifestyles and beliefs, as long as they remain modest and don't threaten anybody.

Respect is not just tolerance. The latter can remain arrogant and condescending, hence both provocative and fragile. Respect is much stronger. It acknowledges the equal value of different antifascist lifestyles - individually as well as collectively.

That's all that has to be asked for a diversity of communities in order to live with one another in inspiring exchange and relative peace, rather than in mistrust and conflict. - Maybe not peace as in love and harmony, but as in solidarity and multiplicity. A lot of colors to beautify. A patchwork of non-fascist communities. An anarchist life, so to speak.

RESPONSIBILITY

Responsibility is a key-virtue for anarchists.

All liberal arguments for the State recur to the point where it is claimed that we can't organize our lives ourselves. We gotta prove that wrong simply by taking on the responsibility to do exactly that.

So, responsibility has to be taken seriously: if we don't want politicians and lawyers and cops to take care of shit for us, we gotta do it ourselves, or, much better, not create shit in the first place. Act responsibly. If there's anything vaguely resembling a 'rule' in anarchism, it might be that. But it's not really a rule. It's a necessary condition.

The politics of anarchism are the politics of responsibility.

REVOLUTION

This is a rather sensitive issue since the idea of a mass revolution is still very precious to a lot of anarchists who believe that giving up pursuing this idea equals a betrayal of anarchism itself. Even though I respect this opinion, I don't think that the dream of a mass revolution should actually be at the center of anarchist attention.

Revolutions do happen, and sometimes they can be a big move towards a more just society. But they don't happen regularly. And they are hardly ever truly anarchist and hence prone to decline, abuse, and corruption; in fact, they very often just exchange one oppressive order for another. And anyway, they are very unlikely in contemporary capitalist societies, with their subtle but immensely effective forms of indoctrination and control.

Remaining exclusively focused on the revolution as the only truly worthy goal for the anarchist struggle might lead to frustration and despair, and the wrong impression that the struggle leads nowhere because the revolution doesn't come closer.

I don't think we necessarily need a revolution. We much rather need something like revolutionary processes that are constantly challenging the prevailing political, social, cultural, economic orders, are permanently changing according to them and their own intrinsic dynamics, and are always an expression of anarchist life itself anyway, not just means to get there.

There will never be a paradise, and there will always be fascist threats in form of racism, sexism, etc., so anarchist life will always include resistance. Sure, it might be not so predominant or easier in certain social orders than others, but that doesn't change the fact that anarchist life is

There is not one anarchist way. In nothing. Not in fighting, not in living, not in style, not in anything else. Anarchism is open. Completely. It signifies a basis to stand on: the commitment to self-determined, egalitarian, and just communities with free individuals living in solidarity, mutual respect, and peace. That's it. Everything else is up to what- and whoever.

In fact, given the natural diversity of our world, everything but diversity in anarchist life would be bizarre. And more, anarchists take delight in that diversity, and treasure its potentials of creativity, exchange, enrichment, and fun.

Furthermore, diversity guarantees originality, immediate critique of and resistance to ambitions of domination by particular social groups, and a wide range of talents for art, work, and play.

The only limits of action are others' freedoms (see the resp. entry), and what guarantees them, namely egalitarianism, justice, and solidarity (for the challenges this involves, see 'Morality'). Apart from that, just dig the multiplicity.

DIY

DIY-ethics are essential for anarchism. It's self-explanatory, really. If we don't want people to tell us how to do what, we gotta figure it out and do it for ourselves. And we take pleasure in this act of self-control and independence.

It's also one of anarchism's essentials that can start right here and now. In the heart of capitalism. Write, print, and distribute your zines yourself. Play, press, and distribute your music yourself. Organize your living space yourself, your education, every part of your life. Of course, in the fucked up world we live in there will have to be compromises, particularly because of financial terrorism, so we might have to sell ourselves to employers. Everybody knows and understands. There is no full DIY possible yet. But apart from taking care of essential existential pressure there is a lot of DIY possible. You have to have a warm place to sleep, clothes to wear, and decent food to eat - but you don't have to make a career as a university-professor, or become a rockstar, or a big-shot manager, or make as much money as you can with your technical skills. You can rather use your talents to support the DIY-underground: write for zines, play DIY-shows, organize events, help setting up autonomous centers.

DIY means relative freedom. More DIY means more relative freedom. No compromise in the pursuit.

ECOLOGY

Ecological systems are living systems, providing the natural habitat for us to exist. It's part of the modern, rationalist egomania of the human individual to not acknowledge this fact, and thereby degrading and disrespecting creation.

As with animal rights (see the resp. entry) it's not about exhaustive moral arguing, it's just about showing the anarchist's appropriate modesty (see the resp. entry) to explicitly acknowledge that without nature's support we simply wouldn't even be. It's about treating her accordingly which means making her part of the anarchist's concepts of respect, solidarity and anti-cruelty.

The phrase might already annoy some, but, I guess, it's really *with* nature, and not against her. Environmental protection from anti-car-rallies via recycling, avoiding waste, cleaning-up-events, consuming environment-friendly products, to organic farms, is all part of anarchist activity.

Yes, there is commercial exploitation of the ecologist movement that reaches into

Greenpeace-ranks on the one hand; and yes, there are weird militant misanthropic, sometimes racist elements on the other; but neither irritation means we shouldn't act as aware and responsible parts of an interconnected whole.

Ecological protection is on the anarchist's agenda.

ECONOMY

Fortunately, anarchism doesn't need any models in general, and that means it doesn't need economic models either. The self-created anarchist communities will create their economies according to the specific circumstances they'll find themselves in. Still, a few general remarks seem possible:

Without being totally anti-technology (see also 'Primitivism' and 'Technology') a big step will be done by simply living a simpler life, and hence needing less. I dare saying that up to 90% of today's modern economy serves nothing but capitalist needs for the production and consumption of complete and total crap.

Basic needs (shelter, clothing, food) can always be pretty easily taken care of, and long-established trade-links can easily be further pursued on a just, ideally non-monetary basis. Concerning technologically more complex goods (I'm talking TV's, stereos, etc.) it all depends on the wider economic and political circumstances: The more complex anarchist communities will become, the easier they'll be able to produce such goods themselves in collective effort. If they stay small - which is the much more realistic scenario -, there's no need to worry, 'cause they'll just get them off the capitalists then. Best by ripping them off. Maybe that's the true anarchist economy anyway.

EDUCATION

1. No schools. Not in anarchism. Schools are the prototype of hell. Demanding conformity, preparing an obedient work force, injecting competitiveness, killing creativity, introducing rules and formality as law. I detest schools. They contradict everything anarchism stands for.
2. No family parenting. The nuclear family is the State's microcosm. It's a social prison that hardly any modern individual can ever really escape from. (For more, see 'Family') Again, attempts may have gone wrong, but in an open community of solidarity there is no alternative to communal education. That doesn't mean kids can't stay with, or even know, their parents. If the community thinks that's best, fine. I don't know. But it means that the kid's emotional universe won't be reduced to mum and dad, and maybe uncles and aunts. They are everybody's children and should be raised as such.
3. No punishing. Self-explanatory. Not only is it educationally disastrous, it would bring authority and cruelty into a community that established itself to eradicate such shit.

Of course, sometimes kids might have to be pulled away from a fire, denied access to potentially harmful areas, reasoned with if their behavior is socially unacceptable, etc. It's part of their learning experience. But that doesn't change the principle. Hell, everybody knows the difference between making someone (in this case kids) understand what kind of behavior interferes with the freedom and happiness of others on the one hand, and authoritarian commands on the other. It's damn obvious.

Plus, anarchists will always treat kids with respect and understanding, even in the above scenarios. They are part of the community, and will be treated as such. Independence and responsibility will inevitably be developed soon.

everyday political and economic horror, we encounter cases of extreme loss, pain, or suffering, that can be relieved by donations or work: natural catastrophes, famines, the lives of the sick and homeless. Relief work doesn't bring the revolution, and, true, it can even work against it, if people are lamed by making them dependent on aid. That's no excuse not to give or help, though.

When and how, of course, is a question totally up to the individual and his or her specific capacities at the time, but the principle remains that contributing to relief work is an act of solidarity - even in the midst of the most disgusting hypocrisy -, and to display solidarity where possible is one of the essential everyday actions an anarchist can take.

Never a substitute for the struggle, but a chance to do some good. Total rejection and ridicule seems not entirely appropriate. Or so I think.

RELIGION

Organized religion is prone to the same developments as organized politics: authority, corruption, oppression. Churches, etc., can't be for anarchists.

It's more difficult with religious beliefs. Just 'cause someone might believe in a god, or a messiah, or a life after death, or reincarnation, doesn't necessarily mean he or she can't participate in the creation of an anarchist life. There are well known historic examples of Christian anarchists who were anarchists because they thought that's what Christianity is all about.

Sure, there is the danger that these beliefs lead you hopes away from actual social life, make you fatalistic, and keep you from striving for social change. One might also claim that religious beliefs are simply silly and superstitious and hinder accurate perceptions of what's going on in the world. Actually, I myself do pretty much think along these lines, but still, these don't seem to be fair enough reasons to discredit all religious beliefs, or exclude religious people from anarchist activities, since, even if it might be the case only for a small percentage, certain individuals and communities might still be able to combine these beliefs with revolutionary politics in a creative anarchist life.

Organized religion belongs to the enemy. Religious beliefs do, I think, justify scepticism, but shouldn't be reason alone to reject others. As long as it is creative and antifascist, anarchist diversity finds space for everything.

RESISTANCE

Resistance is an inherent part of anarchist life. I'm actually tempted to say it will always be like that, even though, of course, I don't know what the future might bring.

But even if it will really always be like that, it's no reason for despair, since resistance is not the way to an anarchist life, but anarchist life itself. Anarchists resist. That's what they do.

How they resist, differs of course. There are pacifist anarchists, there are very militant anarchists. I don't think any way of resistance is per se more effective, and there will always be debates about that question within the anarchist community, but even then different paths might be pursued simultaneously, and they might differ a great deal from others under other circumstances.

Rallies, sit-ins, petitions, letters, conferences, strikes, streetfights, sabotage, papers, radios, festivals, ..., the opportunities are endless. A way to resist for each anarchist.

PROTESTING

Protesting is an essential part of anarchist action. It can never be done enough. I don't think any of the most common critiques have a lot of validity: I don't think protesting has anything to do with digressing from the real issues, being uncooperative, irrational, and desperate, aggravating State control and oppression, or being counter-productive in terms of political reform.

First of all, shit has to be pointed out, as loudly as possible. Secondly, protesting is no means to an end, but the everyday expression of anarchist life. And that's why, thirdly, protesting is not necessarily primarily about change, but about a manifestation of anarchist presence, life, and resistance, and hence an art of anarchist self-portrayal and self-confidence both as a community and for the individuals involved.

That doesn't mean every anarchist has an obligation to protest in a public forum (demos, etc.). There are many ways to live and protest as an anarchist, and none is better than the other (see also 'Diversity'). This applies the other way around too though: If loud public protest is what individual anarchists need for their anarchist identity, who'd dare calling their activities 'desperate', 'unproductive', or 'senseless'? Let everyone do his or her thing.

(Concerning violence involved in protesting, see 'Violence'.)

PUNK

Punk's an anarchist ally.

Today that's actually a bit dodgy to say, since we're being rolled over by commercialized 'Punk' in music and fashion, but so what? Fuck 'em. Punk in its roots is deeply anti-authoritarian and creative, and even in its nihilistic tendencies of self-destruction it remains authentic disobedience in the face of an overpowering oppressive alliance of State and Capital.

Punk epitomizes the links of art, revolutionary politics, lifestyle, and fun. Uncompromising solidarity.

RACE

Race is a category created to divide people along vaguely defined pseudo-biological lines, serving as a supposedly theoretical legitimization for the oppression of communities other than those with the power of definition - who were, given historical developments, basically all over the world the Europeans for the past few hundred years. Racism is dumb, cruel, and appalling. Anti-racism can and will never be separated from anarchist struggles.

Today straightforward biological racism, as, for example, until fairly recently expressed in South Africa's apartheid system, is often substituted by structural racism, where the oppression of racism's victims rather follows social divisions established through racist history, or by cultural racism, where the superiority of one's own community is not explained by biological but vulgar socio-historical reasons. Modifications of racism at best. But we can't be fooled. Racism will be fought in any form.

RELIEF WORK

Relief work in the best case is exactly that: a relief. In a lot of cases today, it's not even that, but simply a hypocritical scheme to gain money and moral credibility.

That shouldn't let us turn our back on it totally though. Sometimes, in the midst of

Kids learn from work and exchange with others, and mainly from play. Special hours might be set aside by communities for the teaching of, for example, reading or writing, but even that will depend on the more general organization (see resp. entry) of the community.

Anyway, kids in an anarchist community will always learn what they need for life. I honor knowledge a lot (even academic knowledge), and I'm convinced it is one of the most stable grounds of independent individuals. But I have not the slightest doubt it'll always be best acquired by kids growing up in a by definition stimulating anarchist environment.

ETHICS

(See 'Morality'.)

FAIR TRADE

The question of fair trade is a bit difficult, since I'm not quite sure whether something like fair trade can exist within a monetary economy at all. The value of money can never be fair, the trade will always be abstract, alienated, and arbitrary regarding concrete human needs. Actual fair trade can only exist in a socialist community with a concrete exchange of goods and services without money being involved (please see the entries on 'Money' and 'Markets' in this regard).

I do appreciate though that today the term is mostly used by people trying to sell products (mostly exported from the 'Third' to the 'First' world) with a higher than usual profit margin for the actual producers. One might argue that the best thing would still be to support local economies and trade, which, at least in terms of idealism, I'd kinda say too. But then again, I don't really see a problem with long-distance trade if there really is equality between the globally distributed communities involved. Especially because today this is also just a matter of realism, as the need for certain goods that can't be locally produced in a lot of places - and hence the need for long-distance trade - is a global social reality (sugar, tea, rice, cacao, bananas, spices, etc.), whether we like it or not. And given that, it seems of course best to shop in the least exploiting way possible.

I don't trust the label too much, but I do think that a lot of what's going on in its name deserves our support within the current state of economic affairs.

FAMILY

I am convinced that the strict nuclear family has no place in anarchism. It's the smallest unit of ideologically dangerously identified collective units. 'You're family, so even if you're a fascist dick, I stand by you.' That's not on. In an anarchist community, individuals gotta collectively identify themselves primarily with the community as a whole, not any sub-groups. No sectarianism.

The bourgeois nuclear family is especially dangerous, usually reproducing the social order of society as a whole: authoritarian, patriarchal, unjust, bigoted. For the free-spirited, family usually means prison. Like school - but earlier, and 24-hours-a-day - it's supposed to prepare for a life of obedience and conformity. We can't have that. The family unit must be opened up as widely as possible, and family relations must be seen in the sense of support and solidarity, not domination and policing. The families in which kids find themselves in will have a huge impact on the community in general.

Of course, families will always remain a natural social unit, at least in the relation of (in a

wide sense) nourishing parents to their children. And in this sense the family does indeed provide the first social unit for an individual to learn social behavior. But, that does neither mean the family has to stay nuclear and closed-in, nor does it give it any *per se* special social status, since that learning experience can also be completely fucked.

We acknowledge family relations as socially special ties that - ideally - play an important part of an individual's personal development, ideally very much supporting an anarchist life. That also means that - especially in present-day society which doesn't offer the lonely individual many other collectives than the family - we respect the maintenance of these ties as special. No problem. But two things remain important:

1. Blood-links alone don't mean shit.
2. No exclusiveness, but uncompromising solidarity with the entire community.

FASCISM

Fascism is the practice of forcing one's own will upon others by means of physical or structural violence. Hence, every State carries fascist elements, even though they might of course be much more intense in some than in others. Capitalism has fascist elements, when, for example, multinational companies make whole communities dependent on the exploitation-jobs they offer. And there are thousands of forms of everyday fascism displayed by cops, parents, teachers, even teenage bullies.

Fascism is the biggest single contradiction of anarchism, and in this sense its biggest enemy. In a certain way antifascism equals anarchism, even though the former might be seen and used as a wider term, potentially including non-anarchist leftist groups, which I have no problem with. The point is that fascism has to be fought wherever it occurs. It's the ultimate evil of our lives.

It's *not* automatically to be equated with violence though. Violence is not necessarily fascist. It can be pure self-defense. Like provoked anti-fascist violence. By all means necessary. (Concerning violence, see the resp. entry.)

FEMINISM

A term that today covers a wide range of political agendas, ideas, and actions, feminism can still function to summarize the female struggle against patriarchy, and for the liberty and self-determination of women.

Of course, all anarchists, female and male, will support that struggle.

The differences within the feminist movement itself are the business of the feminists alone, and can never be reason for not uncompromisingly supporting the underlying cause.

Naturally, anarchists will take special pleasure in anarchofeminist movements, since it's here where the, for the anarchist, inevitable link between women's liberation and social liberation in general becomes most manifest and explicit, but withholding support to other, not explicitly anarchist feminists seems highly inappropriate. An all-or-nothing approach seems to try to deny social realities. To give a simple example, pro-choice-rallies need support regardless of highly-paid business-women being present or not.

In every liberation movement lives anarchist spirit, and anarchists should always be there to keep that spirit as strong as possible.

are still privileged, but no fucks. Instead, they will contribute to the slow process of deconstructing social relations based on injustice and hierarchy, and thereby help leading the way to the creation of social forms in which eventually the problem of privilege will solve itself through its simple disappearance.

PROLETARIAT

At the end of the 20th century the term itself has become very unclear, it seems. Even though there has been talk of the proletariat's 'resurrection' I'm still not sure what that should really mean. The working class of the 19th century now seems to be splintered into different labor (or non-labor) groups, and even though working class rhetoric might still be present within trade unions' ranks, I don't think it still makes sense to count on the working class as *the* revolutionary force (see also 'Class').

Nevertheless, it might really make sense to claim that a new proletariat has emerged in exploited non-Western countries, and also the workers within these remain exploited, so kissing the proletariat as a revolutionary force in the anarchist struggle good-bye seems definitely out of place. The capitalists are doing that enough anyway.

For us, the workers remain essential comrades in the struggle. But not as a 'leading' or 'central' force; instead as one amongst many of the exploited and oppressed (women, migrants, the colonized, etc.) who all together constitute the anarchist struggle as equals.

PROPERTY

Private property is always tied up with a capitalist social order. It separates people, introduces injustice, and breeds competition. Besides, it takes from the people what could otherwise be publicly used (which defines *private* property as opposed to *personal* property - see below), and is therefore theft indeed. Private property has no place in anarchism.

In an anarchist community all goods will be owned collectively. This is an idea inherent to all radical socialist traditions, and I can't see any reason why we should give up on it. It's at the heart of communities based on egalitarianism and solidarity.

Of course, there are certain things of specifically personal use (from the toothbrush to your hand-painted shirt), and naturally individuals will identify these things as their individual belongings. To distinguish such things from private property anarchists have often spoken of 'personal property', a term I still find useful. What makes a property personal instead of private seem to be the following characteristics: a) It is modest and has exclusively to do with personal care and/or individual expression. Nothing related to community service (means of production, transport, communication, etc.) could ever be personal property. b) It will be in constant use by the individual claiming ownership. Unused property ceases to be personal property. (Possible exceptions: goods that are, by means of production or personal history, of specific individual value to the owner - self-made artifacts, clothing, drawings, etc.)

It's up to the different anarchist communities to draw their lines between private and personal property as there can be, of course, different interpretations of the criterias for personal property. But that doesn't change the importance of this distinction as a guideline to help us satisfy modest and harmless needs for personal space and individual expression on the one hand, while preventing the capitalist beast from infiltrating our communities on the other.

PRISON

Maybe situations demanding measures to prevent some people from hurting others might occur always and everywhere, anarchist communities not excluded. But appropriate means to deal with those situations will always be found then.

What does exclusively belong to the State though, is the institutionalized mass lock-up, which contradicts any idea of a free community. Let alone the fact that most people in lock-up don't pose a personal threat to anyone anyway, and that most of their offenses couldn't exist as such in a community not based on presupposed authority, social alienation, economic injustice, and private property.

Anarchy sure doesn't need no bars.

PRIVILEGES

Obviously, privileges go exactly against any idea of an egalitarian community. They indicate injustice and hierarchy. Maybe it has historically been one of the strongest points of anarchist thought and praxis to deny any privileges granted to anyone, including supposed revolutionary leaders. Privileges corrupt, and hence granting them to an exclusive group of people usually equals the beginning of the end of true revolutionary transformation.

At the same time, we live in an unjust and hierarchical society, and so a lot of us are privileged without fault, so to speak. To be white is a privilege, to be male, to be born into/or to grow up in a wealthy family, etc., etc. And these privileges stay with you. There is no escaping and denying that, and no studded leather jackets or piercings, no dumpster diving or begging for change, no breaking with your past or any theoretical egalitarian commitment can alter that. That's not to disrespect any of such activities. In the contrary, I personally embrace all these activities as ways of transforming your identity, opposing the very power structures that tell you who you are supposed to be, and leading the way out of hierarchical on towards more egalitarian social forms through changing the privileged individual. This privileged individual nevertheless remains privileged, though, which is, I guess, my point here. And it does so, both because of its privileged personal history (education, socialization, etc.), and because it will always have a wider range of life-options available than the less privileged: clothes and piercings can be taken off, a job found relatively easily, and the folks can pay for those medical bills. Even if never accessed, the knowledge about these options alone keeps the privileges alive.

I think it's important to remain aware of this for two reasons: One, it doesn't make a lot of sense to accuse people of being privileged, if that only refers to the objective (and arbitrary) circumstances of their sexual, racial or economic identity, and not their daily conduct. Again, the objective circumstances are not their fault. Two, it doesn't seem very helpful at the same time, to ignore or even deny these privileges, 'cause this would almost inevitably lead to dishonesty and pretense which can both be extremely harmful to any attempt to create egalitarian social relations which can only flourish on grounds of truthfulness and genuineness.

The progressive way of dealing with privilege then seems to be: acknowledge it where it exists as an objective given, and then (in a collective effort with the less privileged whose advice will guide you) try to turn it into something supporting the revolutionary cause (through using the skills, assets, and open doors of the privileged to contribute to the struggle). This is very different to the usual reactionary way of dealing with privilege which is: to defend it, to use it for personal advantages and to oppress and exploit the less privileged, to try to even expand it.

The ones who stick to the latter really are privileged fucks. The ones who try the former

FREEDOM

Like democracy (see the resp. entry) one of the most vague and meaningless political terms today. Nevertheless, it remains a value anarchism evolves around.

What is at anarchism's heart though, are not any *rights* of freedom, given, protected, and maybe taken away by an authority, namely the State. Yes, it's better to have freedoms of press, speech, and thought, even if hypocritical and limited, than not having them. But, as rights guarded by the State they can never be deep enough, and our freedom remains a purely passive and dependent one, never able to reach the freedom anarchists dream of.

Their freedom is a freedom of active self-determination. Where people are allowed and able to create their lives fully independently, individually as well as collectively, only there they are fully free in political terms.

Of course, in an anarchist society one's freedom ends where another one's is threatened, and these borders might at times be hard to draw, but so what? Not everything can be a piece of cake. (See also 'Morality') It's the price we gotta pay for being social creatures. But since I find it fun to be a social creature, I'm happy to pay the price of occasionally necessary moral debate to guarantee my and others' widest possible freedom to create nothing less than social life itself.

GAY- AND LESBIAN-RIGHTS

Uncompromising support for any non-heterosexual practices, lifestyles, relationships, and communities. Fuck homophobia.

GENDER

Mainly within feminism, gender has recently been more and more identified as a category of individual imprisonment and social stratification.

Anarchists welcome and support any process of gender-confusion or -crossing or -multiplication as they are expressions of creativity, freedom, and cultural enrichment, and help overcome stereotypes and oppression based on strict gender-identities.

As diverse as possible anywhere, and so here too.

HARDCORE

Hardcore experiences a lot of shit lately, from conservative Christian Hardcore to fascist Hardline Straight Edge.

That's a shame, but it doesn't change the fact that Hardcore was and is home to many anarchist/radical kids, and, all in all, constitutes a movement resembling lots of anarchist ideals, mainly DIY-ethics, an anti-authoritarian stand, and critical energy. The links between Hardcore and anarchism are undeniable and fruitful. It's up to us to keep it that way. No fascist infiltration!

HUMAN RIGHTS

Today, one is easily tempted to dismiss Human Rights as an empty phrase, as an abstract hypocrisy, or simply as eurocentric, patriarchal, bourgeois, and capitalist.

All of this seems very true, and I would never suggest any political argument or action based on defending abstract Human Rights, since it's all so much better when it's all just about

concrete individuals in concrete situations. Human Rights are rather for Statesmen to babble, and lawyers to argue about, not for anarchists.

Having said that, in the international political climate of today a lot of struggles against injustice and oppression carry Human-Rights-banners, from East Timor to Nigeria. And it can hardly be argued that the presence of these banners is reason enough not to support such struggles. I don't deny that Human Rights *can* signify genuine concerns for the well-being of concrete individuals and communities. I don't think it's the best of terms, but hey, so what. It's the cause that counts.

Essentially, maybe we just shouldn't give a fuck about Human Rights - either way.

IMPERIALISM

Anarchists are against empires, against domination, against annihilating self-determination. Of course, anarchists are anti-imperialists. (See also 'Colonialism'.)

INDEPENDENCE

Total independence doesn't exist. As individuals we are dependent on other individuals, as communities on the environment sustaining us. Also, lots of subconscious needs and desires influence our personalities, thoughts, and actions, and they remain out of the control of our conscious influence.

That doesn't mean though that the term doesn't make any sense at all. It does make sense. Despite of the mentioned limitations to total independence, there are evidently social dynamics that allow for more or less individual or collective power and capacity to decide for oneself, and thereby to control and determine one's own destiny.

The enemies here are both legal structures that give some people the power to force decisions upon others, as well as more subtle political and economic orders that allow some people to have more influence on the information of others and thereby on their subconsciousness than vice versa. These are the unnecessary, political restrictions of independence. And these we can, and passionately want to, do without. And when anarchists talk of independence that's what they mean and pursue: communities without authority and interest lobbies controlling the media and the economy. Only in an environment like that can hearts and minds and personalities become as rich, and hence as independent as possible.

We may not confuse being independent with being detached though. We don't want no imaginary bourgeois Cartesian ego. That's egocentric, abstract, patriarchal, and logocentric - and definitely not the independence anarchists mean and seek. This independence knows very well of community, environment, and desire as natural limits. And instead of declaring on them the narcissistic war of the modern individual, they acknowledge these limits as the sole foundation of their entire existence, and hence their only realistic independence, and will always display the uttermost respect.

No fucked up autonomous subjects, but respectful independent human beings. And it's only in these human beings that anarchist key virtues as awareness or responsibility can grow, mature, and become active. In this sense, fighting for anarchism always means fighting for independence. Unseparable.

themselves good or bad, it all depends on their specific use in specific situations. Plus, action still speaks louder than words.

Anyway, everyone gets the picture, since it's pretty obvious: Awareness and sensitivity, yes, any time, self-declared narrow-minded cops, no, never - regardless in whose name they appear.

POWER

I understand power as a term used to describe the influences people have on each other within the complex network of people's relations. It has been said that in this sense power is everywhere (Foucault and others), and I'd agree (and, hence, politics too, I might add - see the resp. entry).

We could say that people don't 'have' power, people rather 'act' power, according to their possibilities defined by the social field: the State, for example, allows cops or judges to act a lot of power, kids or immigrants not; the Capital allows rich people to act a lot of power, the poor not; the bourgeois family allows the man to act a lot of power, the woman not, etc.

That means a) that revolutionary action is not about 'taking over' power, but rearranging the social field, so that power can be acted more equally. This of course means the pursuit of anarchist communities since these alone allow the possibly widest distribution of power and consequently avoid harmful and dangerous points of concentration.

And it means b) that since power relations are here by definition dynamic, there is (practically) *always something* that can be done about them. In other words: Resistance can be and start everywhere, and every kid breaking some of a teachers' power acted over him or her becomes an important subversive. There's always hope.

The classic model of centrally located and possessed power simplified social relations and led to inappropriate revolutionary phantasies. The concept above allows for more complexity in analysis and action. Anarchists should go with it, until something better comes along (see 'Theory').

PRIMITIVISM

Primitivists have made precious contributions to the critique of and fight against capitalism, and the destructiveness of technology, and have taken strong stands for environmental protection and indigenous peoples' rights. Respect.

My problem is though: If a retreat into quasi-pre-technological times is suggested as a revolutionary means, it's first of all unrealistic, and even if I don't wanna discredit utopianism totally (see the resp. entry), I don't think it's helpful to base political programs on it. In fact, it can be dangerous, since one might lose touch with the present reality of the struggles and people's actual needs, and hence might even become alienated and snobbish.

And secondly I don't think premodern or pre-technological or 'primitive' societies are necessarily better (meaning: more just, equal, and free) than others. Power struggles (see 'Power') occur everywhere, fascism is a danger everywhere, and things are messed up everywhere, and I think social anthropology confirms that.

Technology is destructive in a lot of ways, but I don't think in all (see the resp. entry), and I definitely don't think it's the root of all evil. I appreciate critical primitivist attitudes in anarchist struggles, but I don't think it's supposed to be an ideology leading the way.

Like everyone else they shouldn't be defined by their supposed status, but by their actions. Revolutionary peasants can contribute enormously to the creation of anarchist communities - conservative peasants can very effectively hinder them. It's all just a question of which side they decide to be on. Good ones, bad ones, everywhere.

PHILOSOPHY

Philosophy as an academic discipline is fairly uninteresting. Very often it's not much more than boring bourgeois blabla.

But: Understood as something like 'the art of thinking' philosophy becomes as precious for a revolutionary life as arts in general (see 'Arts').

It's the creation of thoughts, ideas, concepts, as works of art, so to speak. That is to say: The more creative they are, the better. Questions of right and wrong don't matter; and neither does formal training nor special intellectual articulation. It's all just about the enrichment of our lives through original concepts by whoever, stimulating our own thoughts, and creating a basis of diverse and exciting ideas that are at the heart of anarchist communities.

Everyone an artist. Everyone a philosopher.

POLICE

The everyday shoeshine boys of the ruling classes. They fight for them, hence, they fight against us, hence, we don't like them and fight against them. That pretty much sums it all up. They belong to the enemy.

Nevertheless, people are individuals, even in uniform, and I do find it appropriate to differentiate between a person's function for the system, and him or her as a person in general. Some cops are actually, to a certain extent, nice people. Some of them really joined the force, 'cause they thought they would do some good. Why am I saying this? Just 'cause I think it's a matter of fairness to admit that not all cops are equal, and - and this is stronger - because I'm opposed to ideas declaring other people free game just because of their social function, even if they are cops. If we have to fight them, we will with all means necessary. But even here the use of violence shouldn't be taken too lightly. Wouldn't we feel way more comfortable in our anarchist communities than in a society controlled by them for exactly that reason: that the use of violent force against others doesn't come as easy as it does for them?

Don't let the cops drag you down. Show them what sovereignty and coolness is all about. Fuck 'em.

POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

I guess what p.c. originally was meant to signify was a political sensitivity in everyday conduct: speech, consumption, leisure activities, etc. Everything with that is fine. Everything is political (see 'Politics'), and sensitivity (and with it necessarily awareness) concerning the relations we as individuals create with the world we're part of is an essential anarchist virtue (see 'Awareness').

So, p.c.-language, or -products can affect our ways of thought and action in very positive ways. Recently though, it seems that there are tendencies mixing up highly appreciated sensitivity with very inappropriate moral rigidity. Especially in the area of speech, using and avoiding certain terms becomes an end in itself, without considering contexts, circumstances, consequences, impacts, and relevance. Terms like 'bitch', 'girl', 'woman', or 'lady', are not in

INDIGENOUS PEOPLE

Indigenous people all over the world had their land stolen and their traditions annihilated by colonizers. A sad and tragic tale.

At the same time, I don't think it's important to point out how supposedly great and noble (egalitarian, spiritual, ecological, harmonious, etc.) their communities were. In fact, this abstract romantication is just the flipside of their concrete repression, and has been just that ever since images of the 'noble savage' appeared way over 200 years ago. These images have always served bourgeois escapist dreams far more than the real indigenous people in their lives, and this is continuing today.

It's not a matter of indigenous people being 'good' or 'bad' (according to what standards anyway?), it's just a matter of justice to support their struggles for equality and/or self-determination and/or anything else that serves their struggle to live in dignity. Indigenous communities are mostly oppressed communities, and oppressed communities have to be able to count on anarchists' support. That's all there is to it; and it's well enough.

INDIVIDUALISM/INDIVIDUALITY

Individualism contradicts all anarchist ideas. Anarchism's about solidarity. Individualism's about separation, isolation, competition, envy, greed. It's capitalism's little brother. It's the life of the bourgeois egomaniac. It is a total and complete obstacle on any road to an anarchist community.

Unfortunately though, individualism has been mixed up with what I'd just like to call individuality by some leftist radicals propagating a society where equality gets confused with conformity: a totalitarian, bureaucratic, mind- and creativity-killing guarantee of frustration and unhappiness. This will always inevitably lead to individualistic rebellion, because no notion of the anarchist union of individuality and solidarity, that allows for individual freedom within communal equality, could have ever been developed.

Life is as diverse as it is interconnected. Solidarity acknowledges the latter, but it needs individuality as its necessary alter ego to acknowledge the former. And there's no contradiction. As solidarity provides a base on which each individual can grow and develop his or her unique and free personality, individuality provides the community with personal characteristics necessary for its anarchist character: independence, self-esteem, critical reflection, creativity, a multiplicity of talents and skills.

Individuality is a personal and social virtue, and as such essentially anarchist. It creates individuals as well as communities that are free, diverse, creative, and happy. It makes life a blast.

Individualism on the other hand is one of capitalism's clone-ideologies. It creates individuals as well as communities that confuse winning with joy. It makes life a battle. Fuck that.

INTELLECTUALS

There's nothing wrong with intellectuals per se. To produce ideas, to analyse and provide theories, is part of revolutionary action (see also 'Theory'). There are only some necessities:

1. Don't claim special status.
2. Stay in touch with social life.
3. Don't be a pretentious universalist, but 'organic' (Gramsci) and 'specific' (Foucault).
4. Support the struggle.

Intellectuals respecting this are comrades. Others are enemies. End of story.

LAW

The Law is a means to control the behavior of the masses. It is in the hand of the rulers, and hence a means for them to control. It belongs to the enemy.

And it's not just about contents at all. As with the State in general (see the resp. entry), there are definitely some codes of law that are relatively better than others, but the Law always remains a set of abstract, formal, written regulations of conduct, and the power of its 'proper' definition always lies with the ruling classes. An anarchist community can never obey to such a thing.

In an anarchist community the individual's behavior will be 'controlled' only by his daily interaction with other individuals. If problems occur, they will be dealt with commonly in a way that seems appropriate to the ones involved. It's all about concrete social community life vs. formal tyranny.

In this sense anarchists might really be a lawless bunch.

LIBERTY

(See 'Freedom' - I pretty much use the terms synonymously.)

LIFESTYLE

Anarchism doesn't know of some political sphere of life separate from life itself. We know of what often goes as 'realpolitik', or might be described as 'professional politics', but when we think of politics it's more than just a combination of power games and a technical apparatus disciplining our lives. It's a term referring to our everyday actions and their impact on the world we're part of (see also 'Politics').

Slogans like: 'All is Politics', or: 'The Private is Political', might get old and boring, but still capture the essence of what I'm talking about. Questions of what to eat, what to wear, where to shop, which TV-show to watch (or whether to watch TV at all), which sports-team to support (or, again, if any), or which music to listen to, are, in this respect, politically very relevant, since they directly touch the ecological, social, cultural, and economic dimensions of our communal existence.

That doesn't mean there's one true anarchist lifestyle that we have to obey to. That'd be a contradiction in terms, and a gross misunderstanding of what I'm after here. We've said it before, and we say it again: We want diversity everywhere (see resp. entry).

All this is about, is to point out the political significance of everyday action, which implies that a certain awareness and responsibility might not just ethically be in order (see also 'Morality'), but might very well help us launch more effective attacks at the mainstream, remaining alert to capitalist's economic incorporation techniques, and hence living more subversive lives.

Being a revolutionary is not a 9-to-5 job. It's who and what you are. 24 hours a day.

LOVE

The bourgeois idea of eternal heterosexual monogamous love seems a highly unrealistic,

Confusion might occur where anti-colonial struggles supported by anarchists (see 'Colonialism') are also launched in the name of 'national liberation'. I guess it's just one of the ironies of the complexity of global politics that under certain circumstances certain terms carry different meanings. In anti-colonial struggles nations mainly refer to an oppressed native community that's denied self-determination. The colonial process has usually first forced them into such a collective identity by colonial labelling in order to control and exploit. The oppressed then simply lack alternative collective terms to articulate themselves. Hence, if used as an anti-colonial tool to give people self-determination, nationalist struggles have to be understood differently and be supported by anarchists.

Nevertheless, *each* nationalism carries the dangers mentioned above, which very often become immediately obvious once a nationalist movement gains power, sometimes even before, during the struggle.

Native, or aboriginal, or just people's struggles seem to be better terms under which to fight anti-colonial struggles under all circumstances, but again, if the fight really is for liberty and justice, it'd be pedantic to let names matter much.

But we always gotta take care with nationalisms nevertheless. In whatever way they present themselves.

ORGANIC FARMING

I'd say the organic farmers movement deserves a lot of anarchist support. Growing local food with as little harm to animals and ecosystems as possible is like an anarchist credo. Agriculture today is the basis of human life, and we know of no sounder agriculture than organic farming, neither socially nor ecologically.

As with everything, there exists a capitalist exploitation of the terms organic or biological, and there are farmers using the label rather to make profit than revolution. But, what else is new? It doesn't harm the original idea a bit.

Organic farms deserve all support. This is the real Green Revolution.

ORGANIZATION

Sometimes we hear that any sort of organization would contradict anarchism. That seems too simple, though. If organization means to agree on certain basic procedures in running communal affairs it's the most natural thing for a community. In this sense, anarchists happily organize.

Only if organization means a hierarchical, authoritarian, formal, static frame in which individuals' ways of behavior are controlled, it contradicts anarchism. But then definitely, And, actually, since today if one talks of organization one mostly refers to such units, it might be pragmatic enough for anarchists to be anti-organization.

But that doesn't mean we don't organize. But as equals. And freely. You know what I mean.

PEASANTS

Social conservatism might really characterize some peasant communities, but so can a revolutionary spirit as well. As always, general rules do not apply. In neither way: as much as peasants are not always in the way of social progression, they are not the one main revolutionary force either.

universal divine or natural laws, but our anarchist dreams and desires alone. This doesn't make them worth less, but since we are the only justification for them, we have to remain self-reflective, open to critique and change, and especially modest, careful, and responsible, rather than self-righteous, reckless, and fanatical, in following them. This also implies there is no separation of ends and means. If we don't express the basics of anarchist morality as drawn above in every part of our struggle, we are lost.

Intolerant fascist behavior is a permanent danger, also for us. We can't have none of that. That's why what can be summarized as the following rings true: Guided by anarchist principles anarchist morality seeks its appropriate expressions in everyday action and struggle with modesty, care, and responsibility, making no difference between means and ends, but seeing them all integrated in general anarchist life.

MULTICULTURALISM

Again, one of those terms that can mean all or nothing today. Nevertheless, it's still safe to say that the term was originally introduced to signify attempts of creating a social environment in which individuals and communities with different cultural backgrounds can live together in respectful interaction, and relative peace and harmony.

I don't really care much about any of today's official governmental multicultural programs, which are mostly formal patterns of control and cultural stigmatization, but the idea itself is at the heart of anarchist dreams.

To avoid anarchist ambitions being confused with current State's policies in this regard, it might be useful to simply stress the 'multi' of the term, and its potential power to cut through all reductionist identifications: Certain individuals should not be reduced to certain cultures which then are expected to find ways of dealing with each other; but lots of cultures should be acknowledged as floating through each individual, so that the social field per se becomes an arena of endless creation and deconstruction of hybrid communities.

We don't want a segregated dormitory. We want a colorful playground.

NATIONALISM

Generally speaking, nations are abstract collective entities used by frightened individuals to give themselves an identity, and with this identity supposed dignity. Needless to say, this existential hook doesn't rest on personal merit, but presupposed exclusion and inferiority of others.

It just happens that a lot of people feel attached and connected to something that's home to them, whether it's a certain community or territory. That I don't see as a problem. But only as long as the relations are actually concrete. No nation is concrete. And as everything that's abstract and politicized it's highly dangerous.

Being aware of where you're coming from, and allowing that awareness to be a part of your individual identity, and even taking pleasure in the feelings of comfort and familiarity it brings, is no problem. Taking pride in belonging to some special and exclusive group of people by birth or blood or passport is.

Nations divide, conquer, rule, and oppress. Per definition, anarchism must be anti-nationalistic.

Transnationalism might even be a better term than internationalism to name the opposed anarchist principle, but words don't matter much, as long as we know what kind of fight they signify.

dangerous, and at times despotic notion, born out of a patriarchal tradition ready to serve the State with establishing mini-units of its omnipresent power (see also 'Family').

In reality, love mostly remains nothing but an exclusive, egotistical cover-up for dominance and dependency.

In its imaginary romantic version, which remains an escapist dream of a better world without loneliness, love stands in the way of radical social change, not unlike religion. That's how Hollywood sells tickets, not how we make revolution.

If we wanna use the term at all, it only makes sense to associate it with embracing the ideals of solidarity, in which your love to others will be expressed as a feeling of brother- and sisterhood that shows in your everyday action. *This* love can lead us out of the miniature social prisons, onto a community of respected equals.

There will always be feelings of a special closeness to other individuals, triggered by whatever, and in no way are especially intimate relationships between such individuals (as parents and children, siblings, life-long friends, lovers, whatever) against any anarchist ideas. We're not closing our eyes in front of human emotions here. But these special relationships will at least be lived within a wider community of solidarity, and hence they will allow for the openness and unexclusiveness necessary to prevent stagnation, dissatisfaction, and bitterness.

Intimacy will always be complicated, and never will I suggest anarchist communities to be paradises on earth not knowing of longing, rejection, or jealousy. It's a question of creating realistic notions and social environments that allow to handle these feelings in the best of possible ways. That's all we can do, it seems. Really put into action, it'd still be a hell of a lot though.

MARKETS

I don't think markets are inherently evil. In fact, markets can be places of fun and communication. People trading things is part of life.

Unfortunately, the market as a nice social center where people get together in brotherly and sisterly spirit to chat and look and trade is today all but an ideal. What we know as markets today - especially in official economic debate - are a far cry from this. Firstly, money introduces abstraction into the process of trading with all the harmful implications that brings (see 'Money'). Secondly (and more importantly), the precondition for the only form of trade not violating basic notions of fairness is economic justice (which we, obviously, do not have): Only if the basic material needs of all people involved in the trade are sufficiently taken care of and satisfied, trading goods can be enjoyed as a sort of social game that has no direct impact on an individual's or a community's basic material needs and well-being. Only then will there be choice in trade: 'If the price is okay, I'll take it - if not, fuck it.' If someone does not have such a choice, but *has* to buy a certain product just to be able to live in dignity, fair trade becomes impossible, and exploitation by the rich the rule. Only if survival does not depend on how successful you are in the market, trading can be fair and fun.

And this is why an anarchist economy can never be a market economy: because a market economy makes success in a competition over essential resources a condition of survival. You gotta become a good competitor in order to live a life not defined by permanent existential concerns. Losers are an inevitable part of the game. Allowing markets to be the dominant economic force will always leave us a long, long way from a life of equality, justice, and solidarity.

As anarchists we have to fight all forms of markets related to market economies. Only where we are able to create social justice instead will we get the opportunity to experience

genuine markets as important aspects of truly communal life.

MARXISM

Marxism has always been an ally and an enemy of anarchism at the same time. Maybe this is a classic love-hate-relationship.

There's historically a lot of respect for marxist theory, its anti-capitalist stand, its ability to mobilize revolutionary masses. At the same time, in a lot of its expressions marxism is dogmatic and authoritarian, and this is not based on an oversimplified equation of Soviet State socialism and marxism, but because it's an inherent part of marxist thought and action, and has been criticized as such by anarchists as early as the late 19th century.

But, even if at times understandable and justified, I don't believe much in overagitated anger directed at marxists and marxist groups. Right now, right here, they're not the real enemies. In fact, especially where openness and flexibility has entered their realms, they can be important comrades in certain struggles.

If some marxists try to impose authority and dogma on anarchists, we will fight them as hard as anybody else trying to do that. But we should not forget that other marxists simply sincerely try to achieve what we want too: a world that's more just than the one today. And we have too few allies as it is to just condemn all marxists right away for maybe not sharing our views concerning individual freedom, authority, or organisation.

If you deal with marxists, check out what kind of marxists they are - and then deal with them accordingly.

MIGRATION

People have the right to go wherever they want, whenever they want. The only things to be kept in mind are the general anarchist principles of respecting others' freedoms.

So, if you move to an area where other communities are already established, you'll settle as a friend, not as a conqueror. As an ally, not as a colonizer. At the same time, if people move to where you might be established, you let them settle as friends and allies, not slaves or inferiors. Imperialism and xenophobia go hand in hand. Obviously, both suck.

For anarchists, the bottom line must be: Where people who don't know each other find themselves wanting to share space, they'll have to figure out a way to do it. With goodwill that'll always be possible. Only disrespect and arrogance bring war.

But should that happen, anarchists will always support the ones having been originally disrespected. Both, anti-colonial local struggles against fascist conquerors, and anti-racist migrant struggles against fascist locals, will always have anarchist support.

MINORITY RIGHTS

Very often minorities are oppressed. Even though anarchists believe in listening to the voices of the majority in decision-making, there are values close to an anarchist's heart that go beyond the sheer counting of numbers. Respect for an individual's and a community's right to self-determination is one of them. Where a community doesn't harm others, or doesn't interfere with others' freedoms, there should be nothing keeping it from independence and self-determination. There's no anarchist life without such a principle. Hence, anarchism supports every action or policy (for example, affirmative action programs) enhancing the possibilities of minorities' self-

determination in current political affairs.

As with multiculturalism (see the resp. entry) I am aware of problems concerning stigmatization, but it all depends on whether you stigmatize or not. Gays and lesbians are minorities pretty much everywhere. As such their freedom and independence has to be guaranteed. That doesn't mean gays and lesbians are nothing but gay and lesbian. Basically, that's all we need to remind ourselves of.

MODESTY

Worth its own entry, since it's such a central virtue for anarchist life.

Anarchists never claim to know anything. And, consequently, they never tell other people right from wrong, nor good from bad, nor what to do from what not to do. They just *want* something: a life of equality, and justice, and peace. And that's actually very modest, and anarchists therefore always will be very modest.

In fact, if anarchists stop being modest, they basically stop being anarchists. Self-righteousness contradicts anti-authoritarianism, and without anti-authoritarianism there is no anarchism either (see the resp. entry). Be modest or be an enemy.

MONEY

Money sucks, but controls our lives. We are all slaves to money, in one way or another, 'cause in modern capitalist society you need money to survive. But: Money is a total abstraction and alienates people from their work and from each other. It breeds greed and envy. Like I said, it sucks.

Ideally, anarchist communities don't know of money. They might trade, but genuinely and based on solidarity and trust, not exploitation and profit. Unfortunately, today anarchists have to deal with money, otherwise, as stated above, they can't even survive.

Under these circumstances what could anarchist ways of dealing with money be? I'd say
a) to find the balance between not cynically wasting it on crap on the one hand, and not letting overblown money-consciousness give you ulcers on the other;

b) not being a tight-ass; and

c) avoiding its use and exchange in social and economic affairs as much as possible.

And, finally, and maybe above all, to always remember it's a capitalist tool and stinks to hell.

MORALITY

Anarchist morality is guided by anarchist principles: solidarity, respect, modesty, anti-authoritarianism. The challenge consists in applying these principles to everyday action, especially when it comes to finding the line between respect for others and justified interference with some of their practices.

Challenging people who pray seems ridiculous, but the challenge of sacrificing animals to some gods possibly justified. Point is: there's no general rule. We have to find this line, and the question of how to best and most appropriately express our anarchist principles in everyday action persistently by ourselves, considering the specific social, historical, cultural, and economic circumstances.

Doing that, we also have to remember that our principles are not based on any absolute,